

MINUTES/ACTIONS

STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION Also Meeting As STATE BOARD FOR VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

Ladislaus B. Dombrowski Board Room
John A. Hannah Building
608 West Allegan
Lansing, Michigan

July 20, 2000
9:00 a.m.

Present: Mr. Arthur E. Ellis, Chairman
Mrs. Dorothy Beardmore, President
Mrs. Kathleen N. Straus, Vice President
Dr. Herbert S. Moyer, Secretary
Mrs. Sharon A. Wise, Treasurer
Mrs. Sharon L. Gire, NASBE Delegate
Mrs. Marianne Yared McGuire
Mr. Michael David Warren, Jr.
Mrs. Eileen Weiser
Mr. Scott Jenkins, representing Governor John Engler, ex officio

I. CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Ellis called the meeting to order at 9:25 a.m.

II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA AND ORDER OF PRIORITY

- A. Approval of Nominations to the Michigan School for the Deaf Citizens Advisory Council - added to agenda
- B. Report on 2020 Vision - removed from agenda
- C. Report of the Superintendent - Report on Property Transfers - removed from agenda

Mrs. Beardmore moved, seconded by Mr. Warren, that the State Board of Education approve the agenda and order of priority, as modified.

Ayes: Beardmore, Gire, McGuire, Moyer, Straus, Warren, Weiser, Wise

The motion carried.

III. AGENDA MATERIALS

- A. Approval of Revised State Board of Education Minutes/Actions of Meeting of June 22, 2000

IV. INFORMATIONAL MATERIALS DISTRIBUTED TO STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

- A. Information on the Status of Periodic Review/Program Evaluation Follow-up on the University of Michigan-Dearborn Teacher Preparation Program - Memorandum dated July 20, 2000, from Superintendent to the Board
- B. Information on the Special Education Advisory Committee Activities Report for 1999-2000 - Memorandum dated July 20, 2000, from Superintendent to the Board

V. INTRODUCTION OF STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION AND GUESTS

Mrs. Eileen Hamilton, Administrative Secretary to the State Board of Education, introduced the State Board of Education, and guests attending the meeting.

VI. APPROVAL OF STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION MINUTES/ACTIONS OF MEETING OF JUNE 22, 2000

Mrs. Wise moved, seconded by Mr. Warren, that the State Board of Education approve the revised minutes/actions of June 22, 2000.

Ayes: Beardmore, Gire, McGuire, Moyer, Straus, Warren, Weiser, Wise

The motion carried.

VII. DISCUSSION REGARDING STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

Mr. Ellis said Mrs. Beardmore, Mrs. Straus, and Dr. Michael Addonizio, whom the Department has contracted with to research and prepare a paper on the policymaking role of the Michigan State Board of Education, have met recently to continue the process of identifying the first steps toward State Board policy development.

Mrs. Beardmore said the background for this discussion has many facets including Executive Orders 1996-11 and 1996-12 which shifted certain responsibilities from the State Board to the Superintendent of Public Instruction, and Executive Order 1999-12 which transferred specific staff and functions to other departments of state government. She said it was made clear in each of the Executive Orders that the State Board of Education shall retain its policymaking authority with regard to the transferred provisions by determining the policies, if any, on which the administration of the provision shall be based. She said the Board's constitutional responsibility and charge is to provide leadership and general supervision of public education and it is attempting to define exactly what that means in terms of how it conducts business.

Mrs. Beardmore said as a result of discussion at the June 22, 2000, Board meeting, and meetings among Mrs. Straus, Dr. Addonizio, and herself, three recommendations have been developed on procedures and activities that the Board may wish to consider for action: (1) recreate the Policy Executive position; (2) bring closure to the remaining issues in Executive Order 1996-12; and (3) establish procedures on how policy will be established in the future.

Dr. Addonizio said the three recommendations are designed to strengthen and formalize the process by which the State Board of Education sets educational policy. He said the first recommendation was discussed at the June 22, 2000, Board meeting and involves the position of a State Board of Education Policy Executive. He said the recommendation suggests that it be an unclassified position appointed by the superintendent with Board concurrence. He said the question is whether the current superintendent should make the appointment or if it should wait until the new superintendent takes office.

Dr. Addonizio said the second recommendation calls for a review of current State Board of Education policy related issues or programs that are believed to be high priority. He said the blueprint of this recommendation was Executive Order 1996-12 which addressed specific education statutes, and either assigned the responsibility to the Superintendent or retained it with the State Board of Education. He said deciding which issues are most important would move the Board's policymaking process forward.

Dr. Addonizio said the third recommendation may be the most far reaching and require the most work. He said it requires the Board to formally establish a procedure for developing and adopting policy, and then communicating with staff after decisions have been made. He said a comparison of the draft document by Mrs. Beardmore and Mrs. Straus to the National Association of State Boards' of Education recommendation regarding what they call the "sequence of policy development" would reveal many similarities.

Dr. Addonizio said it is important to note that the NASBE document states “Educational policy making is a team effort and involves the Governor, the Legislature, the state board of education, and the Chief State School Officer.” He said it is apparent that policymaking is not a new avenue for the Board. He said the Board has been active in defining policy as important topics arise including early childhood and assisting low performing schools.

Dr. Addonizio said a useful next step would be to develop the process and describe the sequence of events by which issues are identified, options are researched, choices are made, and policies are adopted. He said the process that recommendation three addresses would allow the Board to exercise its leadership and general supervision authority.

Dr. Addonizio said the overarching goal for the Board would be standards. He said the Board decides what will be taught and how teachers will be trained. He said after the standards are set, the Board would make recommendations and work with the Legislature to allocate resources to allow schools to achieve those standards. He said the Board would play a key role in establishing criteria for evaluating the performance of individual schools, making recommendations regarding the type of assistance provided, and which agency was involved, e.g. the Department of Education, intermediate school district, or universities.

Dr. Addonizio said he has identified five general policy areas that provide one possible avenue to organize the general agenda for the State Board of Education.

1. Resources and Education Finance - In this venue the State Board of Education’s role could include making policy recommendations for the State School Aid Act and appropriations. If the Board is interested in making recommendations to the Department of Management and Budget and the Governor’s office with respect to school finance, it should be done with clear programmatic rationale. The State Board of Education, through its meetings, forums, consultations, and Policy Executive, could provide the research so it would not simply be a matter of sending a document with spread sheets attached to the Department of Management and Budget, but it could be a summary of research that would speak to the issues that become priorities for the State Board of Education.
2. Quality and Quantity of Those Who Will Teach in Public Schools - “The State Board of Education shall establish policy which will become the basis of rules for certifying teachers in public schools.” That statement came out of the discussion from the June 22, 2000, meeting and reflects Mr. Warren’s point that rules can be issued by the Board on the basis of constitutional authority for leadership. Rules can also be issued by the Superintendent in connection with legislative requirements. In either case, the policy that is the

basis for those rules is established by the State Board of Education. The Board could also address the issue of teacher quality and quantity through State School Aid recommendations, and may want to consider state subsidies for the preparation of teachers in areas that are low in supply such as special education, mathematics, and sciences, or the preparation of teachers who would teach in school districts which are undersupplied.

3. Matter of Choice and School Governance - The Board could address issues connected with choice and governance in terms of recommendations for legislation. Recommendations could address the terms of interdistrict school choice and district takeover, and provide recommendations to the Legislature. Another topic that falls under the realm of school choice is rules governing public school academies in Michigan. These could be statutory rules or self executing rules that arise from the Board's constitutional authority to supervise public education in Michigan. There are questions now about lifting the cap on the number of public school academies that are authorized by universities and the terms under which charter school's would be reviewed. Choice in governance is another important topic area especially in light of the fact that Michigan's charter school program is among the most aggressive in the country.
4. Evaluating and Helping Individual Schools - Here the Board's avenues for policy making could be statutory rules, and in paragraph three of Executive Order 1996-12 which addresses the responsibilities retained by the State Board of Education, Item O refers to the approval of school accreditation standards. There is a gray area as to who exactly issues rules with respect to the accreditation status of individual schools, but it is clear that the State Board would set the policy which would establish the expectations for schools that would be fully certified by the state.
5. Special Populations - This group includes children from low income families who are at risk of not graduating from high school, special education students, pre schoolers, and adult education students. The State Board could address policy in this area through recommendations in connection with the State School Aid Act, or policy directives.

Dr. Addonizio said he thinks the three recommendations that Mrs. Beardmore and Mrs. Straus have developed would allow the Board to begin the process of formalizing and strengthening its policymaking role.

Mrs. Gire said a policies and procedures manual was discussed at the June 22, 2000, meeting which would be a valuable resource for viewing actions taken in the past. She said as new policies are developed, they could be codified and placed in the policies and procedures manual for Board members to access as needed.

Mrs. Straus said many of the Board's policies are in the form of positions on specific issues, and she suggested that it would be helpful to go back five years for that information.

Mr. Warren complimented Mrs. Beardmore and Mrs. Straus for putting together a structure from which to continue the discussion on policymaking. He said he is pleased with the recommendations that have been made, and believes there is consensus that the primary role of the Board is to engage in policymaking.

Mr. Warren said he likes Dr. Addonizio's idea of the Board starting with a vision, setting goals, and identifying policy areas. He said the Board's biennial goal setting process provides a very good framework for content.

Mr. Warren said he was pleased that the National Association of State Boards of Education (NASBE) Boardmanship Review article titled, "The Sequence of Policy Development," was outlined in the memorandum dated July 17, 2000, from Mrs. Straus and Mrs. Beardmore to the State Board of Education, and that there was a synergy between the recommendations. He said that is one procedure by which policies could be made, even though the Board should consider a policy developed by another method if it arises.

Mrs. Weiser said the hiring of a Policy Executive and staff, addressing the points listed from Executive Order 1996-12, and integrating them with the State Board of Education's current strategic plan will flow if the Board can accept the sequence of events that would lead to State Board of Education policy.

Mrs. McGuire said it may be imperative for the Board to set aside the idea of hiring a Policy Executive for now and focus on identifying areas of priority, and how to incorporate those prioritized points with the strategic initiatives.

Mrs. Weiser suggested that the Board have an in-depth discussion regarding whether Mr. Ellis should hire someone for the Policy Executive position because a problem may occur if the Board tried to fill the position while utilizing existing staff unless it were to take a look at when that hire would happen.

Mr. Ellis said he does not think the Board can simultaneously look for a high level executive and a superintendent at the same time. He said he believes that the process can begin utilizing the current Department structure, and if the Board wishes to either add or reassign staff to work specifically on Board related policy issues, it should be under the direction of the Administrative Secretary. He said this can be done without interfering with the superintendent search.

Mrs. Gire said she thinks the Board can decide to establish a Policy Executive position, but agreed it would be difficult to do in the midst of a superintendent search. She said it is important for the Board to establish the process so that it may begin.

Mrs. Beardmore said she believes that it is imperative to recreate the Policy Executive position, but she realizes there is a Civil Service process which must be followed. She asked if there was consensus regarding the need for this position, even though she does not think the process can be completed by the end of the year. She said it is possible to recreate the position and discuss expectations while the necessary steps are taking place.

Mr. Warren moved, seconded by Dr. Moyer, that the State Board of Education recommend to the Superintendent of Public Instruction the creation of a State Board of Education policy office and positions.

Mr. Warren said he thinks it is critical that the Board do this before the superintendent search gets started so the candidates can be made aware of the Policy Executive position.

Dr. Addonizio said he envisions the next superintendent having a complete meeting of the minds with the Policy Executive as to how the resources of the Department may be enlisted in the Board's policy development work. He said it would have to be clear on how assignments on behalf of the Board's policy function flow down to staff and the superintendent would need to be apprized of and in agreement with every step. He said that way it makes much more sense to have the next superintendent participate and be very comfortable with whoever is hired for that position.

Mrs. Straus said it is imperative that the Board, Superintendent of Public Instruction, and Policy Executive work together as a team.

The vote was taken on the motion.

Ayes: Beardmore, Gire, McGuire, Moyer, Straus, Warren, Weiser, Wise

The motion carried.

Mrs. Beardmore said the items listed on page 3 of the memorandum dated July 17, 2000, from Mrs. Beardmore and Mrs. Straus, to the State Board of Education, are a result of a review of Executive Order 1996-12 by Mr. Ellis, staff, and herself a couple of years ago, and Dr. Addonizio recently. She said the Board must determine if there is a policy in place for these remaining items, or if one needs to be developed. She said in some cases the law is very specific and clearly defines what the policy or process is. She said when the staff analysis was completed several years ago, several items were marked that were thought to be basically administrative even though they required a policy to set the parameters. She said it is, therefore, an inventory activity.

Mrs. Weiser said the reason she asked for this to be dealt with after the Board looked at the process is because she was not part of the group that analyzed Executive Order 1996-12, and determined these were the most important.

Mr. Ellis said the items are listed in random order, and those at the top of the list are not considered more important than the others. He said at the Board's direction, staff will review the list of items, determine if a policy is needed, and offer a recommendation to the Board.

Mr. Warren said the Board should decide what policies to focus on and if they are derived from constitutional authority, statutory, or otherwise. He suggested that the Board set a vision for what it wants public education to be, and spend its resources on policies that have been adopted, such as early childhood education, and connecting schools and families.

Mrs. Beardmore said that is basically what is being requested.

Mrs. McGuire suggested that it might be best to concentrate on what the Board can agree on which would be the four goals: (1) Early childhood education; (2) Connecting schools and families; (3) Providing teachers with effective instructional materials and resources; and (4) Improving teacher quality. She said it would be possible to use the goals as a starting point and build on some policy regarding that.

Mrs. Beardmore said she does not think that these are either/or issues, and she envisions recommendation two as more of a bookkeeping item that neither interferes with nor disrupts the four goals. She said this process is an attempt to bring closure to Executive Orders 1996-11 and 1996-12. She said she believes that recommendation should be the primary focus of the Board's discussion.

Mrs. Straus said she agrees that the Board should concentrate on recommendation three, but does not feel that it is necessary to go through each unresolved item from Executive Order 1996-12.

Mr. Warren said he was not implying that the Board did not have an impact on early childhood, but thinks that because the Board has already made progress in that area, it should proceed with that agenda.

Mrs. Gire said the items remaining from Executive Order 1996-12 are not intended as replacement priorities for the strategic planning process, but are simply issues that must be addressed to have closure for this particular point of business. She said she would like the Board to develop a process for establishing policy.

Mr. Warren said if closure is the desired result, then the Board will probably spend the

next several months debating this issue because no consensus has been reached at this time. He said the Board continues to have constitutional authority over issues such as public school academy authorizers, and he does not mind having staff recommend the development of policies for particular issues. He suggested that the Board focus on its four initiatives.

Mrs. Gire said the Board has been charged with the responsibilities listed in Executive Order 1996-12, and it may or may not choose to act on them in terms of a policy. She said it does not change the fact that the four priority areas are in place, and that the Board will receive the Report of the Superintendent which contains items no longer under the Board's direct authority.

Mr. Warren said he does not have a problem with clarification, but expressed concern that the Board would spend an excessive amount of time trying to develop policies on each of the issues left from Executive Order 1996-12.

Dr. Addonizio said the staff function at this point would be to prepare an inventory of policies that do or do not exist in connection with these issues, but stop short of having the Board rearrange its priorities to deal with them. He said the Board could choose to proceed with recommendation three and the process for policy development and apply it to the four priority areas. He said the staff connection with Executive Order 1996-12 would simply be to inventory.

Mr. Warren moved, seconded by Mrs. Wise, that the State Board of Education direct the Superintendent to inventory the policies approved by the Board in the last five years, as well as those policies which may be contained within the statutory provisions transferred in the Executive Order 1996-12 that may go beyond the five year period.

The vote was taken on the motion.

Ayes: Beardmore, Gire, McGuire, Moyer, Straus, Warren, Weiser, Wise

The motion carried.

Mrs. Beardmore said the Board needs to establish a procedure for setting policy which will satisfy a variety of situations. She said several ideas have been presented, but it is her view that process must be developed by members of the Board who will remain after the end of the year. She said the new Board in 2001 will have to work with what is put in place now, even though it will probably require some changes over time.

Mr. Warren said he is pleased with the layout of the memorandum dated July 17, 2000, because it first sets out what policies are and how they are formulated. He said he thinks it

is important for the Board to have a consensus about different types of policy approaches and the effects they have on recommendations or directives.

He said the Board may want to start by adopting, or at least discussing, different types of classifications.

Mrs. Beardmore said she thinks a system must be established rather than just hit or miss as the issues arise.

Mrs. Gire said the three questions that have formed as a result of discussion are:

(1) what is the process or sequence of events; (2) where and how do policies get initiated; and (3) how are they directed.

Mr. Warren said he would be more comfortable if a model or framework were developed which was not the exclusive means of moving forward. He suggested that the Board assemble a procedures manual with an introduction regarding its constitutional authority, and perhaps the categories mentioned in both his memorandum and the memorandum from Mrs. Beardmore and Mrs. Straus. He said it is important to have a document in place so that when the new superintendent and members come on the Board it will be clear what is expected for policymaking. He said it may also be beneficial to outline the Board's authority so that it may be utilized as a public relations tool.

Mrs. Weiser said page 6 of the memorandum dated July 17, 2000, lists a sequence of events which lead to State Board of Education policy. She suggested that staff, the superintendent, and the Policy Executive, be added to the first bullet of that section because the interplay between those parties and the Board is crucial. She further suggested that "With extremely rare exceptions" should be dropped from the fourth bullet of page seven because she thinks that any attempt to develop a policy that represents the thinking of the Board would be extremely divisive if it was not allowed time to germinate.

Mrs. McGuire said she would like the process to be: (1) the Board identifies a problem or situation; (2) the Policy Executive conducts research and provides a recommendation to the Board; and (3) the Board debates the issue, discusses the desired outcome, and what the policy should be. She said that process would be more desirable than fitting the research to a desired outcome.

Mrs. Gire said if the Board requests the development of a policy regarding struggling school districts, the end goal is clear in that students must have a good education and be provided an opportunity for success. She said any research conducted by staff should have that end in mind. She said without some sense of direction by the Board, it could be confusing for the new Policy Executive in conducting his/her research.

Mr. Warren said a goal is typically already in mind when a problem is identified, e.g. if urban districts were having problems with drop out rates, the desired goal is higher

graduation rates.

Mrs. Beardmore said the intention for the information provided in the memorandum was simply to present different viewpoints and issues to the Board. She said it was not expected that the Board would take action or adopt particular items. She said the

Board may want to consider appointing a subcommittee to address some of these issues and report to the Board at a Committee of the Whole meeting for further discussion.

Mrs. Weiser said she feels that a Committee of the Whole meeting would be more productive than an ad hoc subcommittee, and the current discussion will help the State Board of Education hire a new superintendent. She said by picking through some interesting issues and having these discussions, the Board will be a better group as a whole when interviewing candidates.

Mrs. Straus moved, seconded by Mrs. Gire, that the State Board of Education establish a system of procedures for setting policies to meet a variety of situations.

The vote was taken on the motion.

Ayes: Beardmore, Gire, McGuire, Moyer, Straus, Warren, Weiser, Wise

The motion carried.

VIII. RECESS

The Board recessed at 10:55 a.m. and reconvened at 11:15 a.m.

IX. PRESENTATION ON CERTIFICATE ENDORSEMENTS, ESPECIALLY AS RELATED TO THE AREA OF ENGLISH/LANGUAGE ARTS

Dr. Catherine Smith, Supervisor, Program Preparation Unit; Ms. Sue Wittick, Education Consultant; Ms. Sheila Potter, English Language Arts Coordinator; and Ms. Leonie Rose, Professor, Central Michigan University, and Past President, Michigan Reading Association, provided information and a slide presentation, and responded to questions from the Board regarding the certificate endorsements related to English/Language Arts.

Ms. Wittick said there are two levels of certificates offered to teachers: elementary and secondary. She said the elementary certificate permits teachers to teach all subjects in grades K-5, and in 6-8 with additional endorsements. She said the elementary candidate has an option of putting their majors and minors on certificates, but if they choose not to, they are limited to teaching all subjects in K-5. She said if their majors and minors show

on their certificates as endorsements, they must also pass the Michigan Test for Teacher Certification in those areas.

Ms. Wittick said the secondary level certification allows an individual to teach in grades 7-12 in their major, and in 7-12 in their minor with additional endorsements. She said a major must have a minimum of 30 semester hours, and a minor a minimum of 20 semester hours. She said typically the additional endorsements are earned after completion of a bachelors degree.

Ms. Wittick said the current endorsement structure includes 94 different endorsement codes that can appear on teaching certificates. There are two kinds of codes: Single discipline codes. She said the X codes are called group codes, and require 24 semester hours for a group minor and 36 for a group major.

Ms. Wittick said X codes are important because they provide flexibility in the hiring and placement of teachers in school districts. She said this is particularly important in small school districts where there may not be a student population or budget to support a teacher trained specifically in a specific subject area, but they can hire someone who is trained in Language Arts who may teach English, Speech, Journalism, or Reading.

Ms. Wittick said the programs that prepare teachers for X codes have to be balanced between the sub areas, for example, in social studies, there are four sub areas so an individual must take six semester hours in each area for a total of 24 hours for a minor, or nine semester hours in each area for a major.

Ms. Wittick said X codes may be better suited for elementary programs because they are integrated and offered as a single subject, but at the secondary level, subjects are often taught as individual classes. She said it has been argued that teachers at the secondary level need intense preparation in each of the major disciplines rather than the overall X code preparation.

Ms. Wittick said the X codes provide teachers with minimal preparation to teach classes in specialized subject areas. She said this was a problem that was raised by the Committee that proposed the recommendations presented for Board approval today.

Ms. Wittick said typical areas where K-12 endorsements are used include foreign languages, physical education, music, special education, family and consumer sciences, and technology and design.

Ms. Wittick said individuals who have successfully completed a K-12 preparation program still hold either an elementary or secondary certificate, and are allowed to teach in K-12 classrooms only in the particular area of specialization. She said if they have completed a K-12 music program and they have an elementary certificate, they may teach

music in grades K-12, but not any other subject area.

Ms. Wittick said teacher preparation institutions may offer K-12 major or minor programs in reading, but the majority which have approved reading programs require the completion of a masters degree before they will recommend a person for an endorsement.

Ms. Wittick said school districts look for the BR endorsement on a teaching certificate when preparing to hire an individual for a reading specialist position. She said the school district should also consider the candidate's training and whether they have a masters degree in reading which would be appropriate for placing someone as a reading specialist.

Ms. Wittick said the Board has been provided with a chart titled, "Proposed Teacher Certification Program Options for English Language Arts Related Disciplines Including Minimum Semester Hours." She said the proposal is to limit the language arts endorsement to elementary grades or elementary certificates.

Ms. Wittick said the Committee felt that it was very important for individuals who are trained to teach English or reading at the secondary level to have unique preparation in those areas as single disciplines. She said Journalism or Speech are not typically chosen as a major or minor, and so those subjects do not have a lot of teachers qualified to teach them. She said some of those teachers have the current BX Language Arts endorsement at the secondary level and are able to also teach journalism and speech classes. She said the Committee felt that by instituting a new endorsement called Communication Arts, it would place a focus on the preparation in Journalism and Speech and help fill that void. She said the preparation in journalism and speech with a 24 hour minimum requirement for a group minor would still give individuals 12 semester hours in both Journalism and Speech, which would be much improved over the six semester hour minimum that they have now.

Ms. Wittick said the English, Journalism, Speech, and Reading endorsements would continue to be options for elementary and secondary majors and minors, but the proposal would be to eliminate the K-12 option for the undergraduate Reading Endorsement. She said the Reading Endorsement would then appear on either an elementary or secondary certificate, and the preparation for that endorsement would focus on the need for classroom reading teachers.

Ms. Wittick said the Committee chose to keep the BR code for the new Reading Specialist endorsement because the majority of the approved programs currently for preparing reading teachers require a masters degree, and would no longer be available as a major or minor for undergraduate students. She said those people would truly be trained as reading specialists and be prepared to take the leadership responsibilities in a school district for reading.

Ms. Wittick said the standards developed by the Committee will guide the development of a new Communication Arts program, will guide its review through the Periodic Review/Program Evaluation process, and the development of the Michigan Test for Teacher Certificate in that area. She said the standards play a very important function in ensuring that the content ties into both the Michigan Curriculum Frameworks for K-12 classrooms and national preparation standards for teachers.

Ms. Wittick said the brochure titled, “Approved Teacher Preparation Programs,” lists program offerings in teacher preparation institutions, however, it is never 100% accurate because new programs are constantly being approved by the Board, dropped, modified, or corrections made through the Periodic Review/Program Evaluation process.

Mrs. Beardmore said some programs are not offered by many colleges or universities, and she wondered if staff intended to conduct a review and determine if programs should be eliminated.

Ms. Wittick responded that there are some programs that could be eliminated, but this is an age of options; for example, currently driver education classes are offered through outside vendors, but that may change in the future and be offered by school districts once again.

In response to Mrs. Gire, Ms. Wittick said as new standards are requested for Board approval, they are aligned with the Michigan Curriculum Frameworks and benchmarks as well as professional organization standards in the respective subject area. She said even though some of the existing teacher tests are based on the old standards, replacement tests are developed as the Board approves new standards.

In response to Mrs. Gire, Dr. Smith said teacher preparation programs are brought in line with the standards through the Periodic Review/Program Evaluation process.

Mrs. Gire expressed concern that students are being taught by teachers who have been exposed to the new standards, yet they are not being tested on those standards.

Dr. Smith said it takes about two years from the time the Board approves the standards before they are appear on the tests.

Mrs. Gire asked if colleges and universities were offering professional development opportunities to teachers in the field to update them regarding the standards.

Dr. Smith said that issue has not been addressed at this time, though she thinks mathematics and science teachers are kept up to date through materials presented under the Eisenhower program.

Ms. Potter said the Michigan Literacy Progress Profile is a professional development effort

to improve early literacy instruction in schools for existing teachers.

Dr. Carolyn Logan, Director, Office of Professional Preparation Services, said certification endorsements and professional development are two different concepts. She said certification endorsements are related to the initial preparation of teachers while professional development is focused on updating existing teachers.

Mrs. Weiser said she has participated in a National Association of State Boards of Education (NASBE) study group regarding teacher preparation and certification. She said after hearing what is going on in other states, it is evident that Michigan is making great progress. She said she hopes to provide a report to the Board at a future meeting date.

In response to Dr. Moyer, Dr. Logan said teacher shortages and flexibility for districts to fill positions is partially being addressed by the X codes. She said a large school district will probably have the resources available to hire a teacher for a single subject, but smaller districts may not be able to do that and so they are looking for flexibility.

Dr. Moyer asked if the North Central Accreditation reinforced or conflicted with Michigan's certification. In response, Dr. Logan said she thinks they require that a teacher hold the appropriate state level certificate in which they are teaching.

In response to Mr. Jenkins, Dr. Logan said about half of the teacher preparation institutions are actually accredited through NCATE. She said the Board approves the standards and stipulates that if an institution cannot meet those standards, their students will not receive certification to teach. She said some higher education institutions want to go beyond those standards, and so they allow themselves to be reviewed and scrutinized based on the very high standards of NCATE.

Ms. Potter said the English Language Arts standards and all seven endorsement areas are based on the Michigan Curriculum Framework, which contain the content standards and benchmarks and demonstrates what all Michigan students should know and be able to do. She said the Curriculum Frameworks also contain the teaching and learning standards which add to the rigor of the content standards. She said all students should be taught to use higher order thinking, deep knowledge, substantive conversation, and connections to the world beyond the classroom so the content standards and benchmarks for K-12 schools are rigorous.

Ms. Potter said staff began working with the English Language Arts Teacher Certification Committee in 1997 shortly after the Michigan Curriculum Framework was disseminated to school districts and higher education institutions. She said the Committee consists of selected people from the Michigan Reading Association, the Michigan Council of Teachers of English, the Michigan Interscholastic Press Association, and the Michigan Association of Speech Communications, and was given the mission of developing state standards for teacher education programs which are aligned to the K-12 standards and the Michigan

Curriculum Framework, the teaching and learning standards, the assessment standards and the professional development standards. She said the Committee also wanted the standards to be aligned with the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), the International Reading Association, and the National Council for Teachers of English even though it is believed that Michigan's standards are higher than those organizations.

Ms. Potter said the Committee decided that there should be a common framework for all of the English Language Arts program areas because many teachers teach multiple subjects. She said the Committee would expect the teacher education institutions to model the kinds of pedagogy that classroom teachers are expected to use. She said it is very important that both elementary and secondary teachers know what is going on in all disciplines because of the content standards and benchmarks so that students have multiple school based experiences in communities where there is a large degree of diversity.

Ms. Potter said the strands 2.0, 3.0, 4.0 and 5.0 are standards that the Committee would expect all Michigan teacher candidates to achieve. She said the standards for professionalism relate to attitudes and ensure that teachers are self reflective, do some research in their classrooms, belong to professional organizations as students, and keep up with the research in their field.

Ms. Potter said there are four substrands regarding meaning and communication: (1) communicating through speaking, listening, reading, writing, viewing and visual representation; (2) literature and understanding through interaction with classical and contemporary literature, big ideas, and themes in literature; (3) genre and craft of language because students should know the characteristics of the different genre, esthetic elements, structural analysis, and writing; and (4) skills and processes which relate to what teachers need to know to be effective in the classroom.

Ms. Potter said strand 4.0 has to do with pedagogy so teachers also learn strategies for instruction and assessment.

Ms. Potter said strand 5.0 relates to the reading and speech standards because those employees are often required to organize, administer, and manage programs.

Ms. Potter said staff are recommending that the BX code be limited to an elementary endorsement because it allows for a focus on early reading and writing instruction. She said journalism and speech did not require as much detail, but there are some references to those subjects because elementary teachers do develop lessons involving creative drama, and they want their students to be able to perform and publish.

Ms. Potter said the AX code has the potential for making teachers more marketable because of the specialized training in journalism and speech. She said they publish the school yearbook or newspapers, direct forensics, debate, and theatre production, and

receive more training than they would if they were going through the BX group major or minor.

Ms. Rose said many teacher preparation institutions gear their programs toward the initial undergraduate certification, but reading does not quite fit that model. She said a majority of the institutions offer it to graduate students, and so the Committee had to address both issues. She said the reading standards are consistent with the English

Language Arts content standards, the International Reading Association standards, as well as NCATE, but there are differences depending on the level of competency required. She said there is an A Level where the teacher only needs to be aware of the literacy aspects, and the Basic Understanding Level which would be geared toward classroom reading teachers who would have knowledge about literacy development and related instructional assessment strategies, and demonstrate proficiency in using them.

Ms. Rose said the C Level would be for someone who is going to be able to apply this information and standards in a broad in-depth knowledge of several aspects of literacy, not just related to one classroom situation but for a whole district. She said they would get more into professional development and assessment for a larger group than just a single classroom.

Ms. Rose said the BR endorsement is structured to prepare someone to be an intervention reading teacher, or a reading coordinator in a school district. She said they would work with special needs students in literacy, and may be a reading consultant, professional development trainer, or director of reading. She said they need to be very aware of the nature and multiple causes of reading difficulty, comfortable with reading research, curriculum development, and professional development programs in federal, state, and local programs for reading assistance, and supervision of paraprofessionals.

Ms. Rose said the BT or reading teacher's training has an emphasis on regular classroom instruction which would be offered for an elementary endorsement.

No action was taken on this item.

- X. APPROVAL TO MODIFY THE CURRENT LANGUAGE ARTS ENDORSEMENT ON A MICHIGAN TEACHING CERTIFICATE AND APPROVAL OF STANDARDS FOR THE PREPARATION OF ELEMENTARY LANGUAGE ARTS TEACHERS; APPROVAL OF A NEW COMMUNICATION ARTS ENDORSEMENT FOR A MICHIGAN TEACHING CERTIFICATE AND APPROVAL OF STANDARDS FOR THE PREPARATION OF COMMUNICATIONS ARTS TEACHERS; APPROVAL TO MODIFY THE READING ENDORSEMENT AND APPROVAL OF STANDARDS FOR THE PREPARATION OF READING SPECIALISTS; APPROVAL OF A NEW READING ENDORSEMENT FOR ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY

TEACHERS AND APPROVAL OF STANDARDS FOR THE PREPARATION OF
CLASSROOM READING TEACHERS

Mrs. Gire moved, seconded by Mrs. Beardmore, that the State Board of Education (1) approve the issuance of the language arts (BX) endorsement for elementary programs only; (2) approve standards for the preparation of elementary language arts teachers, as discussed in the Superintendent's memorandum dated July 5, 2000; (3) approve a new communication arts endorsement for secondary certificates; (4) approve standards for the preparation of communication arts teachers, as discussed in the Superintendent's memorandum dated July 5, 2000; (5) approve changing the name of the reading endorsement to reading specialist; (6) approve standards for the preparation of reading specialists; (7) approve offering the reading specialist endorsement as an option for previously certified teachers only; (8) approve offering preparation for reading specialists as a graduate degree program only; (9) approve offering the reading specialist endorsement (BR) as K-12 only, as discussed in the Superintendent's memorandum dated July 14, 2000; (10) approve establishing a new reading endorsement (BT) for elementary or secondary classroom teachers; (11) approve standards for the preparation of reading teachers; and (12) approve offering the reading endorsement (BT) as an option for either elementary or secondary majors or minors for initial certification, and as an additional endorsement, as discussed in the Superintendent's memorandum dated July 14, 2000.

Mrs. Beardmore said the information presented was very helpful to the Board members who are or were not educators. She said she feels that the distinction between reading and reading specialist should be made more clear in the documents, and that the specialist should be specified where it states the reading educator. She said educator includes both teachers and specialists, and so a clarification should be made.

Ms. Rose agreed and said that distinction will be made.

Mrs. Beardmore said there has been much discussion regarding the Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP) and how teachers should receive feedback, and know how that would influence change in their instruction. She said the problem is that there are many kinds of assessments which are utilized at the local level, and she did not see them referenced in the Board items.

Ms. Rose said that information is included, but staff could elaborate by listing the different types of assessment.

Mrs. Beardmore said she believes that it is necessary for classroom teachers to have some understanding of statistics and to be able to analyze data in a useful way.

Ms. Potter said the Reading and English Language Arts Endorsements state that teachers must: “document, interpret and report assessments, methods, and results to students, administrators, parents, and the public. Use assessment results to shape or revise curriculum, instructional strategies. Administer and use information from state, national, and other norm referenced criteria in referenced assessment programs to inform instruction and learning.”

Ms. Rose said the Reading Endorsement also includes a stipulation of the use of “information from a balance of formal and informal assessments including standardized tests and state assessments, and classroom assessments for a variety of informative and summative evaluation purposes,” and “selecting, creating, and correctly interpreting results.”

Mrs. Beardmore said teachers must still know how to correctly interpret the assessment data, and have enough knowledge of statistics to determine whether a given assessment includes valid information.

Mr. Ellis said the Board should not make the language so specific that a future teaching program student would have to pass a middle level statistics class.

Mrs. Straus expressed concern regarding grammar instruction in teacher preparation institutions. She said she did find a reference to “grammars” in the standards and questioned if that were in fact a word.

Ms. Potter said she believes “grammars” refers to prescriptive and descriptive grammatical use, for example, prescriptive would be the traditional use, while descriptive would include instances such as beginning a sentence with the word “but” which is not widely accepted.

Mrs. Straus said she has heard and read many media professionals who do not use correct grammar, and she is concerned that the Board is perpetuating that practice by turning out students who cannot write properly. She asked if staff could include that in the standards. In response, Ms. Potter said that would be done.

The vote was taken on the motion.

Ayes: Beardmore, Gire, McGuire, Moyer, Straus, Warren, Weiser, Wise

The motion carried.

X. RECESS

The Board recessed for lunch at 12:35 p.m. and reconvened at 1:30 p.m.

XI. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

There was no public participation at the State Board of Education meeting.

XII. AWARDS AND RECOGNITIONS

There were no awards or recognitions at the State Board of Education meeting.

XIII. YEAR-END REPORT BY MARGARET HOLTSCHLAG, MICHIGAN TEACHER OF THE YEAR

Ms. Sue Carnell, Director, Office of School Excellence, said the Michigan Teacher of the Year Program is an extension of the National Teacher of the Year Program sponsored by the Council of Chief State School Officers. She said this year Michigan has joined seven other states to enlist the efforts of the Teacher of the Year program to work on issues of teacher quality and improving classroom instruction. She said she has the pleasure of introducing Ms. Margaret Holtschlag, 1999-2000 Michigan Teacher of the Year, who has expanded her population of students from those in the classroom to adults around the state in talking to them about the teaching profession. She said not only has Ms. Holtschlag made teachers in the state of Michigan more knowledgeable about the teaching profession, but she has been a wonderful resource for the Department. She said Dr. Peter Bunton, Supervisor, Learning Support, and Ms. Cheryl Poole, Consultant, Professional Development, have been overseeing this project.

Ms. Poole said Ms. Holtschlag has initiated Michigan's new approach to the Michigan Teacher of the Year Program with flying colors, and has spent many hours discussing the Michigan Curriculum Frameworks with teachers showing them how to use the Frameworks in combination with engaged learning and community resources. She said Ms. Holtschlag has also represented the teachers' voice around the state to teacher preparation programs, numerable committees, work groups and organizations, and brought attention to Michigan's fine teachers by being selected as one of the four finalists for National Teacher of the Year.

Ms. Holtschlag said everyone wants to make a difference in building a future for children, and she thanked the Board for giving her that opportunity. She said the task of writing a summary of her year as Teacher of the Year was important in that she was able to think of all she had accomplished. She said there were three priorities that were set in the beginning of the school year: (1) to promote quality teaching through initiative; (2) act as a spokesperson for the teaching profession; and (3) to assist in the Teacher of the Year program.

Ms. Holtschlag said she was pleased to be able to focus on two issues she is passionate about as part of the first priority: (1) global education; and (2) partnering with the community for teaching children and for enhancing student learning. She said she has worked on these issues in the classroom, and was able to transfer this work to teachers.

She said it is a professional development model that partners with Michigan State University and six local school districts bringing the understanding and appreciation of diversity to our schools. She said in addition to several presentations, she has been able to take on some of the leadership with the LATTICE sessions and help establish the program in more school districts.

Ms. Holtschlag said it is known that professional development is effective when it is ongoing, sustained, and directly related to what is going on in the classroom, and that is what she has been able to do this year with global education. She said those same qualities were essential in the Big History Lesson which addresses her second goal for partnering with the community for student learning. She said it was very exciting for her to experience taking the theory and putting it into practice with this model.

Ms. Holtschlag said she trained teachers, and then had the pleasure of teaching with them in their schools as well as the Library of Michigan and Historical Center. She said Ms. Sandra Clark, Director, Michigan Historical Center, has offered a grant to Haslett Public Schools similar to what the Board gave as part of the Michigan Teacher of the Year Program. She said she will have another year away from the classroom to expand the Big History Lesson program from eight to 28 teachers, and will help begin the Big Zoo Lesson at Potter Park Zoo. She said she was proud to announce that the Big History Lesson will be recognized by the American Association of State and Local History with a certificate of accommodation. She said one of the reviewers for this national award stated that when they reviewed the nominations, the photographs of the children stood out as they expressed a sense of awe and joy about what they were learning.

Ms. Holtschlag said her second priority was to speak on behalf of the teaching profession, and she wished to acknowledge the following for assistance: Ms. Poole; Ms. Nancy Mincemoyer, Director, Office of Organizational Development; Ms. Nancy Flanagan, Michigan Teacher Forum; and Department of Education staff.

Ms. Holtschlag said immediately upon being named Michigan Teacher of the Year, her thoughts expanded beyond her classroom and district, and expanded to the state level. She said then when she was named as one of the finalists for National Teacher of the Year, her thoughts expanded again from statewide to the nation. She said going through the entry process in Washington was a great learning experience for her, and she was honored to be a finalist for National Teacher of the Year.

Ms. Holtschlag said she is pleased to be able to assist in the Michigan Teacher of the Year Program, and be able to offer advice regarding increasing the participation of the Michigan Teacher Forum so that the teacher leaders throughout the state continue to stay connected, share good ideas, and contribute to excellence in the profession.

Ms. Holtschlag said on the national side, all the state teachers of the year have met several times during the year to discuss best practices, and what is happening in the teacher of the year programs. She said the next time the group meets will be for Space Camp.

A video regarding the Big History Lesson was shown to the Board.

On behalf of the State Board of Education, Mrs. Beardmore offered congratulations regarding the recognition received by the Big History Lesson. She said good news is not often reported, and she is pleased that Ms. Holtschlag will continue her work with that program.

Ms. Holtschlag said Haslett Public Schools have been very supportive of her efforts as well, and has asked her to submit an article each month regarding the Teacher of the Year program for “The Blackboard” which is a publication distributed to the citizens of that community.

Mr. Ellis said Ms. Holtschlag is the first Michigan Teacher of the Year to be contracted to work with the Department, and it is imperative to continue that practice.

Dr. Michael Williamson, Deputy Superintendent, Education Services, said Haslett Public Schools was given a grant by the Department so that Ms. Holtschlag could work under contract during her tenure as the Teacher of the Year. He said this is new to that program, and was added because previous Teachers of the Year commented they were not given an opportunity to achieve anything after being recognized. He said it was felt that the Teacher of the Year and the Department should create a synergy that serves the community of teachers, and Ms. Holtschlag has set a very high standard.

In response to Mrs. Straus, Dr. Williamson said the Department provides some staff support, and Ms. Flanagan has worked very hard to keep the Teacher Forum involved in meaningful ways.

Ms. Holtschlag said she has been able to not only draw on their expertise this past year, but has been instrumental in bringing that group together. She said members of the Teacher Forum have been invaluable in providing information regarding topics she has had to give presentations on. She said they have been an invaluable resource.

No action was taken on this item.

XIV. UPDATE ON STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION STRATEGIC INITIATIVES FOR THE 1999-2000 BIENNIUM

Dr. Michael Williamson, Deputy Superintendent, Education Services; Ms. Carol Wolenberg, Deputy Superintendent, Administrative and Support Services; Dr. Lindy Buch, Supervisor, Curriculum Unit, Birth through Grade 12; Mr. Paul Bielawski,

Supervisor, School Restructuring and Accountability; Dr. Catherine Smith, Supervisor, Program Preparation and Continuing Education; and Dr. Lucian Parshall, Director, Office of Data and Technology, provided information and responded to questions from the Board regarding the Strategic Initiatives for the 1999-2000 Biennium.

Dr. Williamson said he is pleased to report that the Department continues to work on initiatives and projects that align with the priorities and the strategic initiatives of the State Board of Education. He said he and Ms. Wolenberg felt that it would be more beneficial to the Board to receive reports from Dr. Smith, Dr. Parshall, Dr. Buch, and Mr. Bielawski because of their involvement with the field.

Dr. Buch said six years ago, there were four grants programs in operation for early childhood which have expanded to twelve grants programs for 2000-2001, as well as some additional small projects that she would not consider grant programs.

Dr. Buch said the largest program is the Michigan School Readiness Program which is now serving twice as many children as it did six years ago, and has increased from \$32 million to \$105.8 million. She said evaluation results are available, and collaborations have been established with special education and the child care community which have resulted in a practice for quality and transition between early childhood and the primary grades. She said 160 three year old children were served in 1994 with a budget of a half million dollars, and in 2001, 320 three year old children will be served with a budget of \$1 million. She said the Department will subcontract with the Family Independence Agency's Child Care Program as well as out of school time efforts that the Department and the United States Department of Education are developing.

Dr. Buch said Even Start is a federal family literacy program which has doubled since fiscal year 1994 in terms of the number of families served, investment in funding and quality, technical assistance provided, standards, and the other types of support from the Department.

Dr. Buch said the Department's only role regarding parental involvement in 1994 consisted of providing technical assistance and support to programs. She said this will be the Department's third year of involvement with secondary prevention grants, and had the pilot Parent Involvement in Education Program with \$700,000 in funding last year, and programs for birth through Kindergarten has a proposed budget of \$45 million in the State Aid Act.

Dr. Buch said staff have learned much about starting new programs, regarding evaluation and assessments, and in coordinating efforts into a program that makes sense for children and families. She said that is not all staff is doing regarding connecting schools and families, and investing in early childhood education, but she thought the Board would benefit from the information provided.

Dr. Parshall said the Michigan Coalition for School Technology Improvement is a partner with the Department in assisting staff with the Michigan Technology Improvement Plan. He said they will bring together four key components: (1) Policy Development; (2) Classroom Practice; (3) Theory and Research; and (4) Development. He said the project is currently in the process of negotiation to develop four hubs or centers in Michigan.

Dr. Parshall said the first clearinghouse, Policy Development, will be a resource for all teachers, principals, and parents in Michigan that will contain promising practices, research, and information development. He said staff at the Center will be directed to develop information as needed which is then forwarded to the Dissemination and Awareness Clearinghouse. He said this is a web site which can be utilized by parents and teachers who wish to locate information regarding a specific topic. He said this process is cyclical because what the teacher learns goes into information and dissemination, and back to the classroom.

Dr. Parshall said many teachers have indicated that their principals will not support what they learn at conferences regarding new technology so Capacity Building was conceived, which is actually policy development. He said it is a top down approach for superintendents and principals to buy into technology with policy to make sure that classrooms are being supported.

Dr. Parshall said specific topics have not been selected for the clearinghouses, but they are in the development stage which will satisfy the Board's directive of a web clearinghouse.

Mr. Bielawski said in 1984, the Board recommended that every school should have a three to five year improvement plan which was mandated in 1990 by PA 25. He said many schools have indicated that the Department is putting a lot of demands on them because of the reporting requirements of North Central Accreditation, Title I, and the Technology Improvement Plan. He said staff would like to emphasize to schools that they should have only one plan with very focused goals for improvement, and that those goals should to be reviewed and compared against the results they are getting on an annual basis.

Mr. Bielawski said staff have begun working with North Central, and Title I to develop a template utilizing PA 25 or the school code requirements so schools have a tool through which all of the requirements of these programs can be met. He said an agreement has been reached with both Title I and North Central, and the template is now being reviewed for accuracy, and will include issues such as technology planning, new teacher mentoring, and re-certification so the document is as complete as possible. He said staff would like to emphasize to schools the importance of the school improvement plan and its value to help them consolidate federal applications for Goals 2000, as a key role in the Department's

technical assistance efforts in terms of improving student achievement. He said the Department is providing schools the opportunity to work on their plan any time, any where, and to bring their data into the system and directly export information out of the system that will be usable for annual report purposes.

Mr. Bielawski said the obvious place to start is with a needs analysis which would include MEAP data as a key part of that. He said the Department will give schools the tools necessary to lead them through the development of focused goals for improvement, develop strategies for meeting those goals, and a way to evaluate the effectiveness of the strategies and reporting modules. He said staff believe that the web and CD Rom format can include things like calendars, contacts, data and file storage capabilities, and information that can help schools move forward.

Mr. Bielawski said he believes this template will be a valuable resource for schools, and it will help bring systems together.

Dr. Smith said working with colleagues in the Office of School Excellence and subject area experts in the field, staff in the Office of Professional Preparation have systemically presented standards for Board approval since September, 1999. She said subjects areas thus far include: English Language Arts, mathematics, speech, journalism, health, physical education, family and consumer science, communication arts, reading, and reading specialist. She said staff are developing standards in economics, geography, history, political science, art education, computer science, biology, chemistry, physics, earth science, astronomy, and general science.

Dr. Smith said it may sound like standards are input driven, but the Department is actually asking teacher preparation institutions to show their students' experiences, and that they have learned what they will need to know to be successful in the classroom. She said the standards will address assessment and working with curriculum so they will not be simply a mimicking of the K-12 standards, but will broaden and deepen what a teacher needs to know to be able to develop lessons and interpret assessments.

Dr. Smith said the teacher test preparation schedule requires a minimum of two years for development of a new teacher test. She said even though everyone would like to see the teacher tests to be perfectly aligned right now, it takes a couple of years after approval of the standards. She said once the Board has approved the standards, staff notifies the teacher preparation institutions immediately so that they may begin using them with their new students. She said many of the institutions have been part of the planning committees and are aware of the draft standards, and so it is important to let them know of Board approval.

Dr. Smith said the testing company is working with both the elementary and the secondary level mathematics test so it is hoped that will be ready in the next couple of years. She said new tests for physical education, English Language Arts, social studies, family and

consumer sciences, and in journalism are also under development.

Dr. Smith said the Periodic Review/Program Evaluation process is being revised so that it aligns with what is happening nationally, and because expectations of teacher preparation have changed within the state. She said it is no longer enough to simply count the number of books in the library, and the number of Ph.D.'s. She said the difference is that the process will be based more on data and performance, and less on input than it has been in the past. She said the Department will be asking the institutions to provide some different things to meet state standards such as the seven accountability factors: (1) candidate performance; (2) field placements have been sufficient in duration and content, and that the student has performed satisfactorily in the field; (3) candidates have had experiences with diverse people, both as learners and as colleagues; (4) faculty teaching our candidates have the experiences necessary to be models of pedagogy and understand what the students are facing; (5) parent and community involvement is one area that seems to be uniquely Michigan, and therefore, it is important for students to be ready for that aspect of their teacher career; (6) staff would ensure teachers have the technology necessary to be able to access the web clearinghouse as well as create assignments for their students using technology in meaningful ways; and (7) it is imperative to ensure that people are not just out there student teaching, but are in fact well supervised so they are well prepared to teach in their subject area.

Dr. Smith said the new program will still operate on a five year cycle with training beginning at the end of July in preparation for a January start.

Mrs. Beardmore said she is pleased to hear about teachers being trained to work with communities and families because the Board has adopted a Parent Involvement Policy and it has been noted that some parents and teachers seem to be intimidated by each other. She said if it were possible to establish a comfort level and acknowledge a shared concern and responsibility for the learning of the child, Michigan would be much better off. She said many parents are probably not aware of the information that is available to them through the Department's web site, or they may know about it, but do not have access to a computer. She said lack of communication is a problem and wondered if anything was being done about it.

Dr. Michael Williamson, Deputy Superintendent for Education Services, said staff is aware of the problem, but even the best web companies are still struggling with how to organize information for easy accessibility. He said policy committees meet within the agency and external people are brought in, but there is no solution as yet.

Ms. Carol Wolenberg, Deputy Superintendent for Administrative and Support Services, said a brochure was developed under the Technology Literacy Grant which may have a chance for wide spread use by parents, however, it does not solve the problem of accessibility.

No action was taken on this item.

XV. APPROVAL OF MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING REGARDING
HEALTHY SCHOOLS NETWORK

Mrs. Beardmore said the Board is required to stipulate that it wants to continue with the Healthy Schools Network, and the memorandum of understanding clarifies the expectations that the National Association of State Boards of Education (NASBE) and the National Centers for Disease Control (CDC) have for the individual states.

Mrs. Beardmore moved, seconded by Mr. Warren, that the State Board of Education approve the memorandum of understanding regarding the Healthy Schools Network.

**Ayes: Beardmore, Gire, Moyer, Straus, Warren, Weiser, Wise
Absent for Vote: McGuire**

The motion carried.

XVI. REPORT ON CONSENT AGENDA

- K. Approval of Proposal from Michigan State University for a New Health Education Program as a Minor at the Secondary Level
- L. Approval of Proposal from Western Michigan University for a New Speech and Language Impaired Program as a K-12 Major for the Secondary Certificate
- M. Receive the Periodic Review/Program Evaluation Status Report on the Central Michigan University Teacher Preparation Program
- U. Approval of Nominations to the Michigan School for the Deaf Citizens Advisory Council

Mrs. Wise moved, seconded by Mr. Warren, that the State Board of Education approve the items listed on the consent agenda as follows:

- K. approve the proposal for a new Health Education program as a minor at the secondary level, submitted by Michigan State University, as discussed in the Superintendent's memorandum dated July 17, 2000;**
- L. approve the proposal for a new Speech and Language Impaired Program as a K-12 Major for the Secondary Certificate as submitted by Western Michigan University, as discussed in the Superintendent's memorandum dated July 5, 2000;**

- M. approve the Central Michigan University Language Arts, Geography, History, Physical Science, Earth Science, Chemistry/Physics, Elementary Reading, Art Education, and Early Childhood Education (Child Development major) specialty-studies programs until the next full Periodic Review/Program Evaluation review, as discussed in the Superintendent's memorandum dated July 18, 2000; and**
- U. approve the appointments to the Michigan School for the Deaf Citizens Advisory Council, as listed in Attachment C of the Superintendent's memorandum dated July 18, 2000.**

**Ayes: Beardmore, Gire, McGuire, Moyer, Straus, Warren,
Weiser, Wise**

The motion carried.

XVII. REPORT OF THE SUPERINTENDENT

- N. Human Resources Report**
- O. Report on Administrative Rule Waivers**
- P. Report on Property Transfers - removed from agenda**
- Q. 2000-2001 State Discretionary Projects, Part B (Collaborative Sites of Practice and Inquiry, Comprehensive Parent Services System, Dispute Resolution Project, Michigan's Assistive Technology Resource, Technical Assistance for Collaborative Transition Services, Very Special Arts)**
- R. 2000-2001 State Discretionary Projects, Part B (ACCESS Project, Center for Educational Networking, Interpreter Evaluation Project, Compliance Monitoring, Self-Assessment, and Quality Assurance, Personnel Development Grant, Special Needs Program at the Michigan School for the Blind)**
- S. 2000-2001 State Competitive Projects, Part C (Data, Information, and Reporting: Evaluation; Family Information Exchange Project; Michigan Interagency Collaboration; Parent Leadership Program; Personnel Development System; Public Awareness; Information, and Referral)**
- T. 2000-2001 Technology Literacy Challenge Fund Regional Projects**

Mr. Ellis provided an oral report on the following:

A. Detroit Public Schools

Mr. Ellis said that some time ago information was received regarding a particular public school academy which was chartered by Detroit Public Schools. He said this school was designed to be an alternative school and it experienced problems. He said money was withheld by the Department and an agreement was reached to let them continue functioning until the end of the school year so that all contracts could be fulfilled. He said the school has now closed.

B. Teacher Survey

Mr. Ellis said there was a provision in the State Aid Act last year which called for a survey of teachers in their first, third and fifth years of teaching. He said the survey will be conducted by contract with the Hudson Institute and will relate to issues discussed earlier in the meeting regarding teacher training.

XVIII. COMMENTS BY STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION MEMBERS

A. Arts in Education - Mrs. Kathleen Straus

Mrs. Straus said she recently attended a presentation at the Interlochen Fine Arts Camp on the Arts in Education by Secretary of Education, Richard Riley. She said he pointed out the importance of arts and how they can be used to enhance and further everybody's education.

B. The National Association of State Boards of Education (NASBE)

Mr. Warren said Ms. Brenda Welburn, Executive Director, National Association of State Boards of Education (NASBE), addressed the Board at its November 18, 1999, meeting and recommended that it review each meeting regarding what has been accomplished to improve education in Michigan.

Mr. Ellis said he thinks the Board moved constructively and cooperatively in setting the framework for the selection of the new superintendent, and worked with policy issues which will make education better for Michigan students.

Mrs. Gire said the Board took a step forward with its action regarding reading and language communications which will, in the long run, help children who may need additional help to learn.

XIX. TENTATIVE AGENDA FOR NEXT MEETING

Board members were asked to submit agenda items for the August meeting to the Administrative Secretary. Mr. Ellis said Department staff, the Board President, and Vice President would be meeting within the next couple of weeks to develop and finalize the agenda.

XX. FUTURE MEETING DATES

- A. August 24, 2000
- B. September 21, 2000 (Alpena Area)
- C. October 19, 2000
- D. November 16, 2000

XXI. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 3:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Herbert S. Moyer
Secretary